

63.) (Thrice Amended) The method of claim 34 wherein the [adhesive tape includes a] polyimide carrier layer[, the adhesive tape has a lamination temperature of less than or equal to approximately 100 degrees C, each adhesive layer has a thickness of .0005 inches, and the carrier layer having] has a thickness of .002 inches.

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 24, 2002, and the references cited therewith. Claims 34-39, 43, 44, 48, 51, 62 and 63 are amended and claim 61 canceled such that claims 34-60 and 62-63 are now pending in this application.

Examiner Interview

Applicant acknowledges the telephone interview held on October 16, 2002, between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney during which the claims and the cited references were discussed. Applicant's attorney and Examiner Gallagher agreed that the claims as amended herein overcome the cited references.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 39-50 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended independent claims 39 and 44 in accordance with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed September 24, 2002.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 39-50 are respectfully requested.

First §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 34, 37-38 and 51-63 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) and (b), respectively, as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over either King or Bradley (both already of record).

Applicant has amended independent claims 34, 37, 38 and 51 in accordance with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the interview conducted with applicant's attorney on October 16, 2002.

Claims 52-60 and 62-63 depend from claim 51, and as such incorporate all of the limitations of claim 51. Therefore, claims 52-60 and 62-63 are allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 51.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 34, 37-38, 51-60 and 62-63 are respectfully requested.

Second §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 35, 36 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Tsukahara (also already of record).

Applicant has amended independent claims 35, 36 and 39 in accordance with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the interview conducted with applicant's attorney on October 16, 2002.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 35, 36 and 39 are respectfully requested.

First §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 40-50 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukahara in view of applicants' admission as to what constitutes prior art/the state of the art (hereinafter referred to as prior art admission).

Applicant has amended independent claims 39 and 44 in accordance with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the interview conducted with applicant's attorney on October 16, 2002.

Claims 40-43 and 45-50 depend from respective claims 39 and 44, and as such incorporate all of the limitations of claims 39 and 44. Therefore, claims 40-43 and 45-50 are allowable for the same reasons as amended claims 39 and 44.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 40-50 are respectfully requested.

Second §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 34, 37-38 and 51-63 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either King or Bradley, each in view of Tsukagoshi et al..

As discussed above, applicant has amended independent claims 34, 37, 38 and 51 in accordance with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the interview conducted with applicant's attorney on October 16, 2002.

Claims 52-60 and 62-63 depend from claim 51, and as such incorporate all of the limitations of claim 51. Therefore, claims 52-60 and 62-63 are allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 51.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 34, 37-38, 51-60 and 62-63 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (262)-646-6560 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,
EDWARD A. SCHROCK ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(262) 646-7009

Date 10/18/02 By Andrew R. Peret
Andrew R. Peret
Reg. No. 41,246

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 18th day of October, 2002.

Name Amy Moriarty

Signature Amy Moriarty